

TI-30831

Patent Amendment

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 2, 2005. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 13. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,162 to DeRoo. Applicants have reviewed this reference in detail and do not believe that it discloses or makes obvious the invention as claimed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRoo in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,887,146 to Baxter. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

The Examiner contends that DeRoo discloses a verification interface, since DeRoo's system uses a Human User-Input Interface that integrates a SCP interface and a Mouse Keyboard Interface into a single device along with an interface for a common memory device that is accessible by the SCP (citing col. 3, line 64 through column 4, line 15). The Examiner reasons that the ability of the SCP to address the SCPI and access a common memory is representative of the verification mode in claim 1. Second, the Examiner contends that the SCP in DeRoo can address external RAM as well as the SCPI, and the external RAM is local only to the SCP (citing column 6, lines 45-50, and Figure 2). The Examiner reasons that the ability of the SCP to access the RAM is representative of the normal mode in claim 1.

The Examiner further states that:

Although the applicant's statement that DeRoos's system cannot "provide the debugging capabilities of the present invention because it does not have the

TI-30831

Patent Amendment

capability to selectively redirect memory access requests..." may be accurate in regard to how the applicant's invention is distinguished over DeRoo, it does not directly address the limitations as recited in claim 1.

From the Examiner's rejection and comments, Applicants assume that the Examiner believes that DeRoo shows a system where the SCP can access a common memory device (SCPI) using the Human User-Input Interface and can access an external memory (RAM 48) as well.

Applicants believe that the previously submitted claims can be distinguished from the prior art shown in DeRoo, which merely shows a slave processor that can address an internal shared memory and a system memory. Previously submitted claim 1 specifies a verification interface for passing *system memory* accesses to said system memory in a normal mode and for passing said *system memory* accesses to said shared memory in a verification mode. In other words, claim 1 specifies that the verification interface controls which memory, system or shared, is accessed responsive to an access *intended for the system memory* (i.e., when in verification mode, the system memory does not receive system memory accesses) depending upon whether the verification interface is in normal mode or verification mode. In DeRoo, all memory accesses directed towards the SCPI are received by the SCPI and all memory access directed towards the RAM 48 are received by the RAM.

Thus, the DeRoo device could not perform the function of isolating the slave processor from the master processor subsystem by re-directing memory access requests intended for the system memory to the shared memory contained in the slave processor.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended to clarify this distinction. In addition, claim 13 was amended for some minor grammatical issues.

TI-30831


Patent Amendment

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

April 29, 2005
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595